

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

May 15, 2006

5:30 PM

Chairman Garrity called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Garrity, O'Neil, Osborne, Gatsas, Duval

Messrs.: S. Maranto, P. Borek, R. MacKenzie, K. Dillon, K. Sheppard,
T. Arnold, T. Soucy, K. Clougherty

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Ratify and confirm poll conducted May 5, 2006 approving the registration of a Multi-Hazard Response Vehicle purchased through a Homeland Security Grant in October of 2005.

On motion of Alderman Duval, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to ratify and confirm the poll.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Thousand Two Hundred Dollars (\$1,200) for the 2006 CIP 214506 – Senior Wellness Funding Initiative Program.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) for the FY2006 CIP 612606 Citywide Marketing Plan Program.

Alderman O'Neil asked if I read this right there are no City funds.

Sam Maranto, CIP, stated \$10,000 is City money.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval it was voted to table this item until Mr. Borek showed up.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

CIP Budget Authorization:

610505 Project Greenstreets – Revision #2

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne it was voted to approve the budget authorization.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval it was voted to take Item 5 off of the table.

Amending resolution and budget authorization authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) for the FY2006 CIP 612606 Citywide Marketing Plan Program.

Chairman Garrity called Paul Borek forward.

Paul Borek, Economic Development Director, stated the purpose of this request is to accept a \$25,000 grant from the NH Department of Resources & Economic Development to assist us in marketing economic development opportunities and investment opportunities in Manchester. This was the grant that we were applying for when MDC authorized the department to request \$15,000 from the Board from the MDC marketing account as a match and I would match this with another \$15,000 from next year's marketing budget. The qualifications for the grant were to match it on a 50/50 basis. The original grant request was for \$30,000. We were awarded \$25,000 based upon the amount of funding that remained and the competition for the award. DRED was pleased with our presentation and our request and they indicated that if we needed more later we could possibly come back if the DRED program was reappropriated.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there \$10,000 coming from the City.

Mr. Borek answered there is \$15,000 coming from the City via the Manchester Development Corporation's restricted marketing account and there would be another \$10,000 to \$15,000 of dedicated funds from the operating marketing budget within the Economic Development Office next year.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you tell me in the last eight months how much we have spent in this effort.

Mr. Borek asked in applying for the grant funds.

Alderman Gatsas answered no. Obviously this is about bringing businesses to Manchester – a citywide marketing plan. How many other marketing plans have we seen come before this Board in the last six months?

Mr. Borek replied I am not sure we have seen specific marketing plans. We have seen strategic plans that identify steps that we should take to be proactive in attracting business and improving our economy. The purpose of this grant is to proactively contact companies out of state and also to redo our website and allow it to provide the information that site selection professionals are seeking on the web so they can identify opportunities within the community and this grant also includes provisions to prepare marketing equipment and a marketing tradeshow booth to attend site selection conferences that real estate site selection professionals and corporate professionals attend every year to exchange information and look for opportunities to do business.

Alderman Gatsas asked is this the first year that these funds have been put into the budget.

Mr. Borek answered this is the first year that we have received a grant from the department. The budget has had marketing funds in it in the past yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked so we have done citywide marketing in the past.

Mr. Borek answered not quite like this I don't believe. That is a good question. I believe on occasion in the past we have advertised in local and some regional journals. That is not the most effective form of attracting business these days. I think it is through the web and developing opportunities for face-to-face contact and proactive targeting marketing. For example, the Angelou strategic plan provided us not only the targeted industries but specific lists of companies that would be viable candidates for Manchester because of their needs and our attributes. This plan calls for utilizing those lists and going out and contacting companies through the web and through direct mail and seeking to meet with interested parties on a more proactive basis. I don't believe we have been proactive like this in the past.

Alderman Gatsas asked is it appropriate to add to this resolution or at least a motion that says that we need to get a report every four months on who they have contacted and where the dollars are going so that we understand why we are spending dollars because it is easy to say it is only \$40,000 but \$40,000 times 10 is \$400,000 times 10 is \$4 million and pretty soon we are talking real dollars.

Chairman Garrity replied I will accept that motion at the appropriate time. I think there are some further questions. I have one. When is your marketing person going to be hired?

Mr. Borek responded we are in the process of interviewing candidates now. We hope to have that done in one to two months.

Alderman Osborne asked the \$25,000 does this other \$10,000 and \$15,000 or \$15,000 and \$15,000 have to be put forward before you get the \$25,000.

Mr. Borek answered the match was required to secure the \$25,000 yes. We had to illustrate that it was available. We will have to provide documentation that the local matching funds were utilized for portions of the effort along with the grant funds.

Alderman Roy stated you may have skipped over this or spoken of this when you were going through your presentation but in next year's FY07 budget the Mayor has allotted \$60,000 for marketing in MEDO. How does this \$25,000 or this grant availability play into that next year? Will you be looking for a \$60,000 grant to match the budget amount?

Mr. Borek answered no. This would require \$10,000 to \$15,000 of match from the operating budget.

Alderman Roy stated okay so of the \$60,000 allotted by the Mayor's budget you would be looking for \$10,000 or \$15,000 of that in order to go after this grant again for FY07.

Mr. Borek responded right. We just received this grant so in effect it will be for FY07 and it would utilize \$10,000 to \$15,000 of the operating portion of the budget or the marketing line item.

Alderman Roy stated but if I am reading this correctly the \$25,000 is coming out of the FY06 CIP. I don't know if Bob or Sam want to answer that. What funds are we actually using?

Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director, stated we changed the FY06 CIP. They may not get their money for a little bit but it would be allocated through an FY06 CIP account.

Alderman Roy asked and then if we were looking to continue this through FY07 a certain amount of the FY07 budget would have to be allotted towards going after this again.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. I understand that they have \$10,000 in cash or in kind services to add to the \$15,000 MDC is giving to make it a \$25,000 match.

Alderman Roy asked and that would be FY06 dollars.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the resolution and budget authorization. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion. Chairman Garrity called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Gatsas moved to have the Economic Development Director report to the full Board every four months on who they have contacted to bring to the City with these marketing dollars and what their expected research has done for them. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion. Chairman Garrity called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Dillon, Airport Director, requesting immediate acquisition of two replacement police cruisers due to age and increasing maintenance costs of current vehicles and advising that there are sufficient funds available in the Airport's budget for such purchase.

Alderman Osborne asked are these two vehicles not used at all. Do they still run?

Kevin Dillon, Airport Director, answered they both have well in excess of 100,000 miles and for a police vehicle that is not the best condition for them to be in.

Alderman Osborne asked Deputy Chief Simmons do you think we could use those two vehicles for decoys in Manchester. You are laughing but I am serious. Is it a possibility that we could use these two vehicles for decoys?

Gary Simmons, Deputy Police Chief, stated I would indicate that those vehicles were turned over originally because of their condition.

Alderman Osborne stated it doesn't matter what condition they are in as long as they look like...

Deputy Chief Simmons interjected what do you mean as a decoy. To plant on the road?

Alderman Osborne stated yes just to place on a road or a side street.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated Kevin says they would have to be repainted. They don't look like a police cruiser.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman Garrity stated I am going to wait on Items 8 and 11 until Kevin Sheppard gets here. He got pulled into the Mayor's EOC meeting.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Director of Planning, seeking approval to submit a \$2 million grant application to the U.S. Department of HUD for lead paint hazard redemption.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to understand how this ties into the Affordable Housing Trust. We know based on our last meeting that there may be some interest in spending that money for at least one project and there may be another project that needs some funding. How does...there was some talk about holding money for the lead paint hazardous redemption program and I read in this we are only applying for it now. Can we get some explanation on that?

Mr. MacKenzie stated this is...we have been working with the Health Department on this grant application. We did get a grant award for lead paint abatement about two years ago and that was about \$900,000. The problem is still very significant in Manchester. We literally have thousands of units. The Health Department has noticed that particularly with a lot of the groups coming into the City that the lead paint problem has become even more important. People coming in from different parts of the world seem to absorb the lead paint and have been getting sick. So we are seeking to expand the lead paint program. We have watched what other cities have gotten and believe that we can get a \$2 million grant from the federal government to help address this. We would work with the Health Department in basically fixing units throughout the City. In order to get the grant it is our understanding that we will have to provide a very solid match and Sam Maranto can identify which funds we would anticipate using to match that grant. We believe it can be used from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund primarily because virtually all of these units are used by low and moderate income families in the City and they are fairly concentrated in the older parts, the older neighborhoods of the City. Sam, if you could just identify the sources and the total amount of what we are suggesting to earmark for a matching portion.

Mr. Maranto stated it is our understanding that in order for the City to be competitive for a \$2 million grant we need to come up with approximately 50% of that or \$1 million. We are proposing to utilize Affordable Housing Trust funds as well as CDBG funds totaling approximately \$600,000 and going through private entities for other matches – the Health Department, The Way Home and some grants and hopefully we will have \$300,000 to \$400,000 additional. Should we be able to secure additional leveraging then we would reduce our needs for a local share but the application is due at the end of May and we need to identify that. If we don't go in with 50% we will not be as competitive because a lot of the scoring criteria is really geared towards larger communities and we lose points because of the total number of units so we have to be high in terms of where our leveraging is. For instance, Lowell got \$3 million last year and they are approximately the same size as Manchester. I do feel that if we were to go in with anything less than that we probably wouldn't be successful in getting the money. So we are looking at right now the Affordable Housing Trust funds. There is about \$640,000 or \$650,000 in that account. We are looking for between \$350,000 and \$400,000 of those funds and the additional money from CDBG.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to hear some exact numbers. We are thinking about this amount. You are asking us to approve something and I don't see any specific details in here.

Mr. Maranto responded up to \$600,000 we are looking for.

Alderman O'Neil replied you just said \$350,000 or \$400,000. We need the Affordable Housing Trust fund to work in other areas too so we need to nail this down.

Mr. Maranto stated we have two weeks to nail this down. We are negotiating with private businesses in the area such as Harvey Windows. They are looking to come in and see what they can do for us in terms of discounting prices on materials. We are looking like I said at various non-profit organizations and putting numbers together. So matching would be \$600,000. If we can do better on the private sector then we would decrease that but right now we are looking at \$600,000 in City funds that we have available.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to make sure I am clear. How much from Affordable Housing Trust and how much in CDBG?

Mr. Maranto replied no more than \$400,000 from the Affordable Housing Trust and the balance of \$200,000 would be CDBG.

Alderman O'Neil asked and what is the time period when we will hear.

Mr. Maranto answered sometime in October.

Alderman O'Neil asked and when would we see those funds.

Mr. Maranto answered I believe in January or February.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a concern when I am aware of at least two other projects that are going to need this Affordable Housing Trust money and Bob and Sam, there are no other funds we can commit towards this. None?

Mr. Maranto responded correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is for a project where we may not see money until February of next year if we are successful and we have projects on the books now that can create housing units in this City.

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes and I was hoping that Fred Rusczek would be here. This is a very significant issue for the Health Department and they feel it is imperative that we try to get additional funds for lead paint abatement so we are trying to accomplish that.

On motion of Alderman Duval, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to table this item.

Alderman DeVries asked could the Planning Department answer whether this is time sensitive or not and we would be missing any deadlines with our tabling action tonight.

Mr. MacKenzie answered if the Board does not meet next week or have a telephone poll then yes we would miss the deadline for the application.

Chairman Garrity stated we could do a telephone poll.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from Public Health Director requesting approval to accept \$78,894 in grant funds from the NH Department of Health and Human Services for Flu Pandemic Planning, to execute a related Memorandum of Understanding between the NH Department of Health and Human Services, NH Department of Safety and the cities and towns, and to authorize the City to proceed with contract amendment documents once received.

Alderman Osborne moved to approve the request. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion. Chairman Garrity called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity asked do you want to skip Item 11a until Mr. Sheppard gets here Alderman Roy.

Alderman Roy answered I am good to go forward with Campbell Street if other Aldermen are okay to go forward with the different communications but Kevin did request that we wait for him.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 11b of the agenda:

11b. Communication from Alderman DeVries regarding Skyline Drive and Roysan Street

Alderman DeVries stated the pictures that were photocopied unfortunately really don't do this project justice. What you have is a street that is at the bottom of a rather steep slope that all winter long has constant run off. It will build up six to eight inches thick of ice. Every day during this last winter when it was above 32 degrees and there was any kind of melting we had the loaders and scrapers and Highway vehicles out there trying to scrape down because they had the school buses trying to come around the corner and sliding sideways, etc. It has been looked at as an in-house project. They have minimized the drainage correction to bring this into a dollar amount that was feasible to accomplish this year. It appears to be an \$80,000 project and I am asking the indulgence of the Board to add that on so that we don't spend an equivalent amount of money in manpower and trucks going out there trying to keep the roadway passable and hazard free for another winter.

Chairman Garrity asked is it a sewer issue or just run off.

Alderman DeVries answered run off.

Alderman O'Neil asked Alderman DeVries does this tie in at all...I know we talked about work on Roysan and Lois Street maybe. This is not part of that?

Alderman DeVries answered Skyline Drive is up off of Bryant Road. That is the project that is \$80,000 that I am funding. Tied into the reply on that letter was...I had asked for clarification on the storm drain project that this Board has already looked at that we thought was going to take care of both Lois and Roysan and, in fact, is only going to take care of half of that – Lois. If the Board wished to

appropriate additional dollars to finish that project as well but the main intent I was bringing forward tonight was to address Skyline Drive at \$80,000.

Alderman O'Neil asked and it is not in the projects that have been previously listed.

Alderman DeVries answered correct and the reason I am not asking you to look at the additional dollars for the Roysan Drive is that I realize that the dollars are extremely tight this year and I did try to prioritize only those absolutely necessary safety type issues or infrastructure on roadway improvements.

Alderman Osborne asked Alderman DeVries this run off that you are talking about when did this all take place. Is this something recent or has this been going on for years?

Alderman DeVries stated I do believe it has been exacerbated by some of the construction that has taken place up on the hillside behind them. Anybody who has watched meetings that we had with Crystal Lake in the past who have heard me talk about the springs for Crystal Lake, which are located on this hillside and any extreme concerns we had for blasting and disturbing the water they did have some minor construction on the Crystal Lake side of this hill and it is possible that that somehow disturbed the run off coming down off of the slope but it is certainly the last...it was horrible two years ago and unbearable this last winter. It was an extreme safety hazard. As I said it would build up six or eight inches of ice thick across a 75' x 35' or larger area. It was an extreme condition that required Highway going out there everyday that it was thawed enough for them to try to scrape the ice down. I can't tell you why it has been exacerbated but what has been an ongoing situation certainly has taken on great urgency.

Alderman Osborne asked with all of this construction going on causing it do we have any liability on our side with all of this run off when they had this construction.

Alderman DeVries answered I certainly don't have the scientific degrees to address it but the construction was down slope on the other side. I am extrapolating that that could be the reason that some of the water...I know when there was blasting for the sewer that went in around Crystal Lake there was some disturbance of all of the water that would run through there so I am just assuming that that might have been...but nobody could ever point a finger for liability purposes. I don't know if Kevin Sheppard can answer that.

Alderman Osborne asked Kevin do we have any recourse here or don't we or Mr. Arnold do you have any ideas of what we could or couldn't do.

Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, stated I mean as far as liability issues I agree with Alderman DeVries that there has been a lot of blasting in that area and there is a lot of ledge in that area. To point a finger at one project or one developer for any issues that are out there I think is very difficult. We try to address the situation out there as best we can. I am sure like she said we will send graders out there to cut ice as necessary. There is a lot of ground water. There is a lot of surface water because of the ledge.

Alderman Osborne asked how many different developers were out there.

Mr. Sheppard answered we have had sewer work that has been done in that area and on Bryant Road there was a development, I believe Philip's Farm.

Alderman Osborne stated I am talking about private developers. Mr. Arnold do we have any recourse at all or don't we?

Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, replied I could answer that without more specific facts.

Alderman DeVries stated I really don't think that there is any recourse.

Chairman Garrity asked Mr. Sheppard where is this on the priority list.

Mr. Sheppard answered this project falls in between what we would consider a minor drain or chronic drain project. Typically we like to limit our chronic drain projects to smaller size projects because the funding is typically \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year.

Chairman Garrity asked are there other priorities on either side of your small or large chronic drain projects above this that are not funded.

Mr. Sheppard answered I believe if you look at the questions the Committee had under 11a the chronic drain list, I believe it is on our chronic drain list.

Chairman Garrity asked this one where you have the footnote on the bottom. Is that the one?

Mr. Sheppard answered in my correspondence it is the third sheet in. It says chronic drain projects in the upper left-hand corner. If you go to the next sheet...

Chairman Garrity interjected major drain projects. Is that the one I should be looking at?

Mr. Sheppard answered chronic drain projects.

Chairman Garrity stated I see it on the footnote at the bottom. Is that the one I should be looking at?

Mr. Sheppard replied like I said this falls in between those because of funding. Unless we get a large amount of funding as part of our chronic drain we would probably attempt to get that work done as part of our major drain work.

Chairman Garrity stated educate me on the \$38,000. Is that to do part of the project? The footnote says Skyline Drive materials estimate has been prepared for \$38,000 to cover the cost to eliminate worst area of icing. What does that cover?

Mr. Sheppard replied that is to run an underdrain along Skyline Drive. I believe Bruce Thomas from my office worked with Alderman DeVries and located certain areas along Skyline Drive that we feel if we put in drains it would intercept a lot of this water before it made it to the roadway.

Chairman Garrity asked so the total is still \$80,000.

Mr. Sheppard answered if it is a contract. It was \$38,000 in-house.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't now if I can bring something to your attention but I will give the Committee something to look at. If we look at the \$1 million under 71007 Parking Enterprise that is coming out of the one time account, which is for technology and if you go to the general bond obligations 411907, which is also for technology if it could be arranged and the Finance Officer is here and he can comment on it and I don't know if they have all of the details right now but it is something to look at that would give you \$300,000 more in bonding capacity if we could use the \$1.3 million out of the one time account for technology. If you are looking for money it would be about \$300,000 in bonding money you would have that you could transfer over to the Highway's chronic drain projects or whatever the case may be. I just want to bring that point to your attention.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to make sure I understand all of this. Kevin, if we go to the first page that is entitled Chronic Drain Projects December 27, 2005, the project listed...all of the projects listed have been funded?

Mr. Sheppard replied on the first page if it is listed as approved by CIP that means it has been funded. The lines on there are maintenance items that we will take care of within our budget.

Alderman O'Neil asked so the first page is settled.

Mr. Sheppard answered exactly.

Alderman O'Neil stated so we go to the second page and there is currently almost \$48,000 in the Mayor's recommended \$500,000 correct in FY07.

Mr. Sheppard replied right and some of that is CDBG I believe and not all of these projects would fall under CDBG.

Alderman O'Neil asked but the 36 projects on that sheet total \$360,000 correct.

Mr. Sheppard answered right.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you have to tie those 36 in with the larger projects on the next page.

Mr. Sheppard answered no. We look at them as two separate lists.

Alderman O'Neil asked what about funding sources.

Mr. Sheppard answered that is really up to the CIP Committee or the Mayor's Office. In the past we have always got a funding source of cash for chronic drain and bond for major drain projects.

Alderman O'Neil stated on the second page that listed the 36 or prioritized the 36 projects what is the funding source for those 36 projects. The chronic drain allotment in the previous page or the major drain projects following?

Mr. Sheppard replied it would be the chronic drain. We would attempt to get these done out of time out of the chronic drain allotment or allocations.

Alderman O'Neil asked so right now there is approximately \$15,000 available and you could address some of those in the top six projects.

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Chairman Garrity stated I am on the same page as Alderman O'Neil was and other chronic drain projects. Is Skyline Drive #17 because of the cost or is it because that is where it falls?

Mr. Sheppard replied actually that is a mistake. Skyline Drive shouldn't even be shown there as a contract number because that wouldn't fit within our parameters.

Alderman DeVries stated I think if you look at the next page, the major drain projects, you will see Skyline Drive listed there as \$230,000. What we did...because the severity of their problem is too great to ignore and I didn't feel there was realistically any way that I was going to get a \$250,000 project passed we looked at improvements that could be done in-house at \$38,000, which will at least offer relief for the next winter and take care of the hazardous condition. That is why you see this dropped from the major drain into the immediate resolution at \$38,000 for materials if it is done in-house or \$80,000 if it is a contract piece.

Chairman Garrity asked so the problem can be solved for \$38,000.

Alderman DeVries answered we hope that it will at least improve their situation for the following winter. We recognize that this is an area that is pending hopefully sometime in the future for sewer installation and that is probably the more likely time to look at the major road reconstruction project that was envisioned initially by Bruce Thomas.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we beat on this a little more. I guess the sheets don't follow right. I see on chronic drain Skyline Drive \$125,000 with a footnote next to it saying materials contract \$230,000. I don't see the \$38,000 anywhere on here.

Chairman Garrity answered it is a footnote.

Alderman O'Neil asked what should the number be under Item #17 under other chronic drain projects.

Mr. Sheppard stated what I believe I was trying to say is #17 was a mistake. That was an old estimate that was put together. When this list was updated that was not taken off. The numbers you see under the e-mail on 11b from Bruce Thomas to Alderman DeVries are the correct numbers - \$38,000 for materials or \$80,000 by contract.

Alderman O'Neil asked so you are saying the amount next to Item #17 should be \$38,000.

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Chairman Garrity stated my recommendation would be to bring this up under 11d. I think we are going to get further into the CIP budget.

Alderman Osborne stated Mr. Sheppard getting back to the run off again, when you have major projects with major concerns and the engineers are doing this work for this particular project shouldn't they know what type of blasting and what type of run off they have from it. I know if we had something on our land and we changed the dynamics on it and interfered with our neighbors I think we would be in trouble and I think they would take us to court. I am just looking to the future. When we look into things we just let them go and take it for granted but I think we should look into it a little bit deeper when we have big projects – what the implications are after the blasting or after the change of the dynamics of the land or the height or the depth or whatever it might be what is going to happen to the surrounding area.

Mr. Sheppard replied this was an issue before all of the blasting occurred. There has also been groundwater run off in this area and freezing in this area. It is not just from the blasting that occurred. I don't know if anyone could even say the blasting...you know people may say that the blasting has made it worse but can you prove that? I am not too sure that is the case.

Alderman Osborne stated well it has been there forever and we had no problems. Back 40 years ago did we have these problems over there?

Mr. Sheppard responded to be quite honest I don't know.

Alderman Osborne stated I don't think so but anyway there is a reason for it and that is all I am trying to say. Why the City has to come up with everything at the end of it...it is not too fair. I just thought maybe we could look into it the next time we have a project like that. Thank you.

Alderman Gatsas asked Mr. Sheppard can you start me where it says major drain projects at the top and it says current funding available \$48,000 where is that money.

Mr. Sheppard answered there is a balance in an existing CIP account.

Alderman Gatsas asked that is an existing account.

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked so that is available. Is that cash or bond?

Mr. Sheppard answered quite honestly I forget whether it was cash or bond. I don't know if CIP can help?

Alderman Gatsas asked and the Mayor's budget has \$500,000. Is that bond or cash?

Mr. Sheppard answered that is bond I believe.

Alderman Gatsas asked so the total that is available is \$547,000.

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if we went up to the page above that that says other chronic drain projects that totals \$359,000 if we applied the \$359,000 to the \$547,000 in round numbers we would have roughly \$180,000 left to do other projects.

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated now if you were spending the money would you spend the money and get rid of these projects.

Mr. Sheppard responded the other difference between chronic drain and major drain projects are chronic drain projects are the projects that we do in-house and that is why you see the numbers as low as they are. Major drain projects are projects that we contract out. If we were to try to do...well I don't believe we could accomplish all of those projects within the next three years based on our other work if we were to get approval for all of those projects and that is part of the reason we work with CIP and the Planning Department in allocating \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year because typically that is the amount of work that we can do other than our street reconstruction work or other special projects that we have ongoing.

Alderman Gatsas asked the Walnut Hill Avenue drain. Can you tell me what that does and where it is at?

Mr. Sheppard answered that is up off of Union Street. It is a dead end that is north of Whitford Street. There has been a drainage issue up there for quite a long time. That area has gotten developed but this water has always...again it is a groundwater or over land flow of water that has now created a problem where it is going across private property and there is the potential for a lawsuit because the water coming down the street is creating an issue on private property.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many houses does it affect.

Mr. Sheppard answered I would say...Alderman Roy is saying 15. I was going to say up to 20 in that area.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much is the total cost of that project.

Mr. Sheppard answered it is \$230,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked are there more funds coming in from another source.

Mr. Sheppard answered at the same time we would be putting in a sewer line. There is no sewer in that area. It was our belief that it would be best if we were going to be blasting up in that area to run the sewer as well as a drain and that way we would be able to split the cost of repairing the roadway out of the sewer fund. That \$230,000 isn't a complete road restoration. Some of the funds for road restoration will now come out of the sewer side of that project.

Alderman Gatsas asked of those 15 houses, Alderman Roy, how many are would tie into the sewer line.

Alderman Roy answered 15 is a conservative number but approximately 5 at this point would be able to tie into the sewer line and they were promised sewer in the mid-80's.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the total cost of that project.

Mr. Sheppard answered it is about \$490,000 to \$500,000 between the sewer and the drain.

Alderman Gatsas asked what about water. Do they have City water?

Alderman Roy answered yes.

Chairman Garrity stated I would like to have Tim Soucy come up as soon as possible and ask him about the lead paint because he has to get back to the operations center.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we come back to this or do you want to send this someplace else.

Chairman Garrity asked where would you like to send it.

Alderman O'Neil answered I don't know. I was looking for some money here and I think I found it. Am I correct to say that in the proposed CIP budget there is \$35,000 in cash for chronic drain?

Mr. Sheppard stated that has been, I believe, reduced and changed. Some of that is CDBG and all of these projects don't fit within the CDBG area.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there \$35,000 in cash for chronic drain.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that was in the Mayor's proposal. We are recommending some changes.

Chairman Garrity stated that brings us to 11d. Let's wait.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne it was voted to remove Item 10 from the table.

Communication from Public Health Director requesting approval to accept \$78,894 in grant funds from the NH Department of Health and Human Services for Flu Pandemic Planning, to execute a related Memorandum of Understanding between the NH Department of Health and Human Services, NH Department of Safety and the cities and towns, and to authorize the City to proceed with contract amendment documents once received.

Chairman Garrity asked do you want to start this Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. MacKenzie stated again to summarize and for Tim as well we are looking for a very major lead paint abatement program. We need a match probably of \$600,000 from the City and of that we were looking to take \$400,000 from the Affordable Housing Trust fund. The Aldermen had concerns about taking that much money from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund given that there are still other projects that will be looking for that and I think they wanted to get a gauge from the Health Department as to the important of this project.

Timothy Soucy, Health Department, stated with that I will certainly do my best to answer the questions. Lead paint poisoning continues to be an issue in the City of Manchester. Last year I believe we saw about 140 children with elevated blood lead levels. The primarily way that children do get poisoned is from lead based paint, primarily in windows. The days of leaded gasoline are over. We see very little lead poisoning from water pipes or from toys or from leaded gasoline. The issue of lead paint is around painted surfaces in dwelling units. Often the question comes up I lived with lead paint and I don't have any ill effects. The issue is as paint over time begins to degrade, particularly in windows, and creates a fine lead

dust that is typically when and where we see children become lead poisoned. So the vision of children chewing on windowsills is not how we see kids get poisoned. It is typically a dust issue from the old painted surfaces breaking down over time. There has been talk over the years as to whether encapsulation or abatement is the best way to address lead paint issues and we have found that encapsulation is a short-term solution where lead based paint abatement, removing completely the lead hazard, is the safest way to protect children and also provide better housing primarily for lower income families. What we are looking to do is request a large grant of \$2 million from HUD who has typically funded lead based paint removal activities, not only within the City and the state but around the country. Certainly they want the City to show its commitment to protecting the health of the kids, which is why we are bringing this forward to the Board for approval.

Alderman Osborne asked was there some kind of a program at one time for lead paint in the different homes where the landlords had to participate somehow.

Mr. Soucy answered yes. Years ago back through the late 80's and into the mid 90's the Health Department had a program by which when children were poisoned we would go out and conduct an investigation and order unit abated and then follow-up on those abatements. There was also a case management piece to that by which our nursing staff followed the children to make sure that they had routine lead screens to follow-up. That was funded primarily by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention. That funding went away in the late 90's at which point we turned our enforcement authority back over to the state Health Department that now conducts those investigations and abatement orders. The problem with that is we use children as the canary in the cave model. We wait for kids to get poisoned and then we do something after the fact. This money will help us address units to prevent children from becoming lead poisoned in the first place.

Alderman Osborne asked would landlords be participating in any way with this new program.

Mr. Soucy answered yes. We would certainly strive to get property owners on Board and we have worked with the property owners associations in the past to provide them information as to what grants are available. Once again it is an economic incentive for property owners to do the right thing by helping to get some funding to assist them in making units lead safe.

Alderman O'Neil stated Tim I would be clear that I don't think anybody here is questioning the importance of this program. I think what we are trying to do is a balancing act with other requests. I am aware of two projects that will provide different levels and forms of housing in the City that in my opinion were not

properly funded in the CIP budget. What do you believe the chances are of us receiving this grant?

Mr. Soucy responded that is a good question. I don't know the answer to that. I think the greater the commitment on behalf of the City, certainly the positive review from HUD. We have worked with the HUD folks in the area over the years on lead poisoning and they certainly recognize the City's commitment in the past but when you are talking about a \$2 million grant they certainly want to see some financial commitment from the City as well. When we look at affordable housing, there is affordable housing and there is safe affordable housing and I think this would help those that may be at the greatest risk for lead poisoning get into some affordable housing. Unfortunately one of the advantages to having a lead free home is that it is a marketing tool. It is a selling point to be able to market a home as lead free and unfortunately that helps drive the price of affordable housing up in some regards. Hopefully this money would help to create more lead safe or safe affordable housing.

Alderman O'Neil stated we heard earlier from the Planning staff that if successful the money probably would not be available until January or February. What are the chances that this money would actually be spent in FY07?

Mr. Soucy replied I would defer that question to the folks in Planning. I don't know the answer to that as to what the process would be.

Mr. Maranto stated those funds would be spent over a three year period.

Alderman O'Neil asked so we then have other avenues to match this money then including future CIP budgets.

Mr. Maranto answered no. We need to show the commitment two weeks from now. Next year we could have funds available for other projects. Right now we need to show a commitment from the community that we have those funds up front.

Alderman O'Neil stated my frustration here tonight is we have a significant project in this City that can extremely impact positively the lives of many people that now with...when were we presented with this a month ago I guess that in eight weeks we have to make a decision and it now competes against other money. I would have thought or hoped that the City staff could have got together and made a presentation to the Aldermen early on that they were considering applying for this program and now I am sitting here wrestling with do I commit those funds and then there are no funds available for these other two projects that I am aware of and that is where I am at tonight. I have to be honest that I am disappointed in

City staff on this. That something of this importance was not brought to our attention earlier before this whole thing was put together and now kind of boxed us in on the decision we have to make. It doesn't necessarily reflect on the Health Department or Planning but you two were the two departments that were involved in this. I don't know if anyone else was. I am a little disappointed.

Alderman Osborne asked how much of an area are we competing with. How many cases of lead poisoning do the others have? I mean how do they determine who is going to get the money and who isn't?

Mr. Soucy answered I am assuming it is a nationwide competition. When we look at cases of lead poisoning we don't really look at numbers but we look at what the rates are and rates meaning numbers per 100,000 or per population. It is not only base number of kids poisoned but you look at the age of housing stock, percentage of your community that was built prior to 1978 which is when lead paint was banned. So we use a couple of different indicators to help boost our application.

Alderman Osborne asked what do you think our chances are.

Mr. Soucy responded I don't know the answer to that because I don't know what other communities are competing for the money. Certainly Manchester demographically speaking we know that we have a very old housing stock that supported the mills. We know that we have socio-economic issues. We know that we have cases of lead poisoning. Being a refugee resettlement area we know that we have an even more susceptible population than our typical age cohort for that. I think we have made successful pitches in the past for other sources of funding based on some of those factors.

Chairman Garrity stated the fact that Manchester is a designated refugee center for the State of NH, are there any other available besides grants of that nature to take care of lead poisoning.

Mr. MacKenzie replied not through the refugee program.

Chairman Garrity asked how many units will this abate.

Mr. Maranto answered between 250 to 300.

Alderman DeVries stated Mr. Soucy it has been a few months but I did attend the call to action on lead paint held at the Health Department and there was a figure that really caught my attention that day, which made me stand up and listening to the lead paint issues. It was a correlation because it is very easy to track the cognitive loss that a child has when they do have actual lead poisoning and

correlate that to the actual special education expenditures that we are making for children just because of lead paint poisoning and it was something to the tune of \$700,000 over the last three years in Manchester alone that we can attribute to special education costs. Does that sound right?

Mr. Soucy replied yes.

Alderman DeVries asked so is it fair to say that for us not to...we also happen to have had the last reported death in the U.S. for lead poisoning, which occurred years back. I know Manchester at that time it was explained how far the State of NH actually is behind the rest of the country in addressing this national initiative and wouldn't that make it more likely that we would be on the receiving end of this grant?

Mr. Soucy answered I certainly believe so. I think as we see our rates continue to increase in the State of NH around the country we are seeing rates decrease. It would be an indication that there is a problem that we really need to focus some energy and some financial efforts into in the community. Getting back to your special education costs, every time a child is poisoned there is a cognizant development delay. What lead does...the body has no use for lead paint so it causes some delay in one's learning ability. The higher and longer someone is exposed, the greater that delay is and there have been numerous studies at the national level that show that those lost IQ points as a result of lead poisoning not only result in increased special education costs, but decreased productivity as adults and those numbers have been quantified and when we take those quantified numbers and apply them to the numbers of children that we are seeing in the City that is how we are coming up with those type of figures that we can indirectly attribute to lead poisoning. Once again we are not following individual children and saying that because their lead level is this we know that their IQ rate is this but as a rule we expect to see increased special education and other costs to society as a result of lead poisoning.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like to offer something to the Committee. I think most of the members understand it but I think it is worth repeating again. On the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, that is an ongoing thing. If they receive this money for example and I think it has been stated by Sam that possibly they won't be using that money for three years and if affordable housing comes along then we have to use some of that money but I am going to let the experts speak to that and explain the Affordable Housing Trust Fund because this has been going on for a long time and we have used that money plenty of times. Mr. MacKenzie, if you would please?

Mr. MacKenzie stated I did want to learn a little more from Alderman O'Neil as to which projects he felt were in jeopardy.

Alderman O'Neil responded I would gladly share that with you. Serenity Place and Families in Transition.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I know that one of those will be discussed when Alderman Garrity gets to another line item. Families in Transition we are following. We have been a very close partner with them and helped complete three major projects for them. We do not think we are abandoning them as far as the recommended amount for Families in Transition.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you believe in the project that they have been to the Planning Board for, the City has committed to what they believed the City was committing to financially.

Mr. MacKenzie responded I am not sure I understand that question.

Alderman O'Neil stated when I look at...it looks like we are committing...I am trying to find it in here and I can't.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I believe it is \$200,000.

Alderman O'Neil replied right and my understanding is that they thought they were getting more than \$200,000 when they moved forward.

Mr. MacKenzie stated they had requested more than that but in the past they have also requested more than they have gotten and in the end we assisted them in completing their projects. That includes the Family Mill on Second Street, their major addition in the corporation housing area and their original project, which is renovation of one of the mill buildings.

Alderman O'Neil asked is it your belief, based on what you know this evening, that they can complete their project with the \$200,000 that the City has committed.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is somewhat early in their financing. I guess what I am saying is that as the project will take really a year to get going that if we think that there is a need for additional monies to complete that project we will come back in the next CIP process to do that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am lost on something. Haven't they already been to the Planning Board?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked how is this pushed off for a year. You lost me on that one.

Mr. MacKenzie answered they will still have to complete all of their financing. They do not have all of their financing in place. They do not have final design done. They are still away from breaking ground on the project. They wanted to get site plan approval from the Planning Board before they closed on the property. They have not closed on this yet and it will be sometime before all of their low income housing tax credits, their bonding and other financing will be in place.

Alderman O'Neil asked can you share with me where you believe the funding that is being recommended for Serenity Place stands.

Mr. MacKenzie answered after the last Committee meeting we went back and looked at it and felt that \$200,000 could come from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund for the Serenity Place project.

Alderman O'Neil asked that is because it fits correct. Do you believe they could use more money?

Mr. MacKenzie answered they would be happy to have more money. In the first meetings we had with Serenity Place, we talked about \$200,000 and we talked about that as a loan and they seemed comfortable that their project could happen.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to authorize the Planning Department (working with the Health Department and The Way Home) to submit a \$2 million grant application to the U.S. Department of HUD for lead paint hazard redemption and ask the CIP staff to set aside a mix of CDBG funds and Affordable Housing Trust Funds totaling \$600,000 to match the \$2 million being requested.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to say that I am very disappointed that we are at this stage tonight with this.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from EPD requesting acceptance of a NHDES Watershed Restoration Grant in the amount of \$60,000 to complete the Nutts Pond Watershed Improvement Project in 2006.

Alderman Osborne stated I gave Mr. Sheppard some counts of traffic going into Hannaford.

Mr. Sheppard stated we are on Item 8 I believe.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval it was voted to accept the grant.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 11a:

a) Communication from Highway addressing several items

Alderman Roy stated just to bring the Committee up-to-date as is in your agenda, Item 11a actually has a number of projects included in it, one of which is the chronic drain, one of which is Hanover Street sidewalk and the third being the project I am focusing on, which is the Campbell Street improvements. The Committee requested a construction estimate, which has been provided in your package and does give a brief summary from the engineers mentioning that they did value engineer it and it could not be phased. The second part of what was asked to be provided were traffic counts leading in and out of the actual Hannaford front entrance, which is technically in Hooksett. As you can see from the numbers provided in your package, which didn't occur to me when we were asking for counts, quite a few people use the back entrance to leave the property. As you can see the am and pm peak counts are quite a bit different going in and coming out of Northside Plaza. So if your am peak has 240 people coming in and 180 coming out that means 60 are finding another entrance and there is only one so that dumps the difference back onto Hamel Drive. This is, as Alderman DeVries said earlier, a tight budget year so we are all being very frugal in what we are bringing forward. This is the second of only two projects that I have requested for Ward 1 and though it is a large size it is a very necessary project due to safety and problems in that area. I would also like to mention that even though this is physically located in Ward 1, this is a City shopping plaza and it is on one of our main thoroughfares, Daniel Webster Highway, and it is a traffic safety problem. Alderman Gatsas and I have spoken about this. He went up and looked at the property as he was well aware of it but spent some time looking at the traffic and I think he will concur as the Ward 2 Alderman that it is a safety concern and we should look to achieve some change there, whether it is the full lighting or at least a road reconstruction. I am open to this Committee to help us move this forward for safety sake.

Alderman Osborne stated as I was discussing we do have the counts up here right. These are the new counts in the right hand corner?

Mr. Sheppard responded correct.

Alderman Osborne stated according to what we have here we have 50% of the traffic going into the shopping center. Then 25% goes up Hamel Drive and the other 25% goes up Campbell Street. So this plaza is 50% of the problem. When I asked somebody to go up there and ask them if they want to participate in this particular project seeing that they are getting 50% of the traffic there and causing 50% of the problem why couldn't we get a few dollars from the shopping center.

Chairman Garrity stated I guess that is a question for Alderman Roy. Have you reached out to them yet Alderman?

Alderman Roy replied we have reached out to them. We do have some concerns as the majority of the shopping complex lies in Hooksett so there is some jurisdiction. The north end of the rear entrance comes out into Manchester, as well as the Hamel Drive and Bicentennial Drive intersection. We have reached out to them. I personally feel that they are watching these proceedings to see if the City is serious about improving it. I can't understand why as a business they would not be willing to participate but they have not made any commitments or positive suggestions so far.

Chairman Garrity asked have you reached out to Hooksett.

Alderman Roy asked the town.

Chairman Garrity answered yes.

Alderman Roy stated no I have not.

Alderman Osborne stated well even though...let's say this interest is on the Hooksett line or in Hooksett. They are still getting this traffic, which is causing our problem here in Manchester. Without this particular entrance I don't think they would be anywhere so really it doesn't matter whether it is in Hooksett or Manchester. They are still benefiting from the percentage of clientele they are getting into that shopping center. I think it is wise and prudent to try and proceed a little further with this. Waiting for us to go ahead and do something then of course they are not going to do anything. It is a matter of...this is probably late in the stage but I think it could be done.

Alderman Roy stated while I agree with you completely and I will work with not only our City staff but the owners of the property, Northside Real Estate Trust, to accomplish that the majority of the traffic that goes through this area from Crosbie Street, across to Campbell and DW Highway is residential or City traffic whether

they live in Hooksett, Manchester, Wards 1, 2 or any other surrounding wards. It is a safety concern.

Alderman Osborne responded if you subtracted 50% of this traffic from this particular situation you wouldn't need to be doing what you are doing.

Alderman Roy stated we can't block it off.

Alderman Osborne replied that is the way I am looking at that's all. You know the City always takes the brunt of everything it seems.

Alderman Roy stated if we could put a toll booth at the entrance and pay for this I would happily do it.

Alderman Osborne stated that is not the idea. I mean Stop n' Shop where I am spent a lot of money on the corners there.

Chairman Garrity stated that being said everyone knows that Gold Street is an issue in the south end of Manchester. Projects like these take time. I have been working with the folks down there for 14 months. They have given a \$4 million commitment. Just today it is public knowledge that the Diocese of Manchester is going to actually donate the land, the City is not going to have to buy it, to put the Gold Street bypass through there. So it takes time. I agree with Alderman Osborne. You have 50% of the traffic going into the Northside Plaza. It benefits a commercial piece of property and I think they should at least participate in some way instead of waiting for us to make a \$1.1 million move.

Alderman Roy responded while I appreciate the Alderman's concerns, when we look at the intersection and the bridging on South Willow Street and the entrances if we don't capture the dollars in development it is very hard to go back 15 or 18 years later and ask for off site costs. So while I have no problem going and talking to the property owner I believe it is a step that the City needs to take. This has been a problem for many, many years – longer than most of us have been on this Board. I just ask for your indulgence as a Board to look at the safety concerns and the effect on the residential areas that surround it and the traffic on Campbell Street.

Alderman Osborne asked Mr. Sheppard didn't you mention that you were going to send a letter to the management. Did you ever do that?

Mr. Sheppard answered I believe I was going to work with Alderman Roy regarding that matter. That was my understanding after the last meeting. That we were going to work with Alderman Roy to do that.

Alderman Osborne stated I think the City itself should be doing a letter more than just...nothing against Alderman Roy or myself but we are just Aldermen. If the City of Manchester puts a letter out to this particular management property I think it might mean a little more to them than just an Alderman. They probably don't know half of what is going on up here now. I think it needs a little more powder behind the bullet as you might call it.

Mr. Sheppard replied that is fine. If that is the will of the Committee we can do that.

Alderman Osborne stated I think we made that motion last time didn't we that they were going to send a letter out, the Highway Department, to the property manager. Mr. Chairman didn't we do that?

Alderman Roy stated because of the time sensitive nature of Committee meetings we thought it would be best to contact them directly. That has been harder than we envisioned. They are not opening the door quite as rapidly to spend their money.

Chairman Garrity asked is it your opinion that they are waiting for us to make a move.

Alderman Roy answered I think they are looking to see a significant commitment on the City side.

Alderman Osborne stated there is such a thing as making a commitment but not going forward with it.

Alderman O'Neil stated number one I need to defend Alderman Roy on this. He has taken this over the last two years through the proper process. First a traffic study and secondly some preliminary design. I think the cost caught all of us by surprise, although I think it truly reflects the marketplace today. I think the fact that we have some challenges with our CIP budget greatly affects the opportunity to do this project. As I review the budget and again I think if we were going out to a private contractor the budget items truly reflect the cost to bid this project but I know and I have spoken with Kevin and with Frank about whether or not we could even...whether this could be phased and the answer is no. If you are going to do it, you have to get in and do it and get out of there. Kevin, I haven't asked you these questions ahead of time and I haven't talked to Alderman Roy about this but I will throw out a couple of suggestions. Number one there are some costs in here that if we took on the project ourselves, and I understand it is a significant project,

the cost would not exist. \$100,000 for mobilization. We don't include that in any projects we do in-house.

Mr. Sheppard replied correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated I look at items like alteration to traffic signals - \$100,000. If we utilized our Traffic Department could that cost come down? I look at some items below that like uniformed officers with vehicles, flaggers, maintenance of traffic. I am not really sure what that means and portable changeable message signs and we own some...the point being with all of this that if we took a look and I know it is a stretch for them, it is a bigger project than they normally would do but if we took a look at this could we significantly get those costs down if we attempted to do this project in-house? I haven't had that conversation with the Director or the Deputy Director. I generally know...I think I am correct on this. Traditionally when we do a project in-house it is about 1/3 to 1/2 of the cost if we contracted it out.

Mr. Sheppard responded that is a good range.

Alderman O'Neil stated we may be able to get at this a little bit. The other thing I would like to throw out is it is common on these challenging projects, which this one is, to have a second set of eyes take a look at it and do something called value engineering to see if they can come up...what if instead of doing A you did B and that might save you some money. Those have been helpful in some cases. I don't know specifically that a value engineer would be helpful in this but I just throw that out. So before we write this thing off completely and again I haven't spoken to Alderman Roy about this but I am wondering if we can take a look at this to see if it possibly could be done in-house.

Mr. Sheppard responded based on the workload of our current CIP between CDBG street reconstruction, our bonded street reconstruction and various other projects that have been given to us to be done in-house over the next year or two, this would be a very difficult project for us. I am not convinced that we could fit this into our schedule based on our current workload.

Alderman O'Neil asked within the next year.

Mr. Sheppard answered definitely not within the next year.

Alderman O'Neil asked is it worth taking a look at again.

Mr. Sheppard asked regarding in-house or...

Alderman O'Neil interjected you hired a consultant to come up and it is a consultant we have used for other work and they do a great job for the City but this may be something we really need to take a look at. If we think it warrants addressing and the only way to get there is to do it in-house then maybe we have to lay out a plan to do it that way.

Mr. Sheppard stated like I said I don't believe we could accomplish this project in-house over the next year. Does it need a second set of eyes from an engineer? We had taken a look at this intersection and actually come up with a conceptual plan that the engineers ended up coming up with, which was similar to ours. Theirs was almost a second set of eyes on this project. There are not many ways to resolve the issues out there quite honestly. There is not much land available. There is not much room available to put additional lanes. They came up with a similar solution to ours. Sure, we did share our solution with them but I don't think that drove their decision. Obviously you can always have another set of eyes take a look at something.

Alderman Gatsas asked Kevin how many accidents have occurred there.

Mr. Sheppard answered I apologize. I didn't bring the traffic study with me tonight.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have the traffic study but it didn't tell us how many accidents.

Mr. Sheppard replied I believe in the traffic study they talked about some information they gathered from the state. I am not too sure if Alderman Roy collected anything recently from the Manchester Police.

Alderman Roy stated if you want I can read the whole...I don't have a timeframe but I have eleven rear ending accidents at Campbell and Hooksett Street, five right angle crashes at Campbell and Hamel Drive and two at Campbell and Bicentennial Drive and I believe there is further data in Appendix D of the traffic study.

Alderman Gatsas stated well the eleven rear ending accidents, this is not going to solve that problem. A rear end crash going down Campbell Street at the light just means somebody didn't stop.

Alderman Roy responded not to be argumentative but with the roadway reconstruction there would be a through lane for traffic coming from Campbell Street to DW Highway and a designated turning lane lined turning onto the new Bicentennial Drive so there would be more lanes than there are now.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you know if those crashes were from people taking a left turn or right turn or going straight through to Crosbie Street. It doesn't identify it. It could be that all 11 were going through to Crosbie Street. My concern is still the layout of the plan because nothing in this plan stops anybody from making that left hand turn onto Campbell Street and not tying traffic up from DW Highway going up Campbell Street east. There is nothing there that stops that. It just gives you a longer stacking lane.

Mr. Sheppard asked off of Campbell Street. Is that what you are talking about?

Alderman Gatsas answered on Campbell Street going down to DW Highway it gives you a longer stacking distance than when you come off Hamel Drive now. It just gives you another five cars of stacking.

Mr. Sheppard stated it gives us the additional distance plus an additional lane.

Alderman Gatsas responded it does but if someone comes out of Hamel Drive making that left and he is stacked he is stopping the traffic from going east on Campbell Street just as they do now.

Mr. Sheppard replied correct but this plan would allow for additional stacking or an additional volume of cars being two lanes and each of them being longer than the existing ones.

Alderman Gatsas stated if that person was making a left on the DW Highway from Campbell Street and his lane was stacked it is not going to change that stacking. That is normally where you have the problem. My suggestion is that people go and look at this because I was there on a Saturday for three hours watching it and they were stacking that way and it is basically people coming out of the shopping center and cutting across when there wasn't enough room to stack. If you move this up further it just means more cars stacking and there still isn't that ability to make that turn. I don't know...unless you put another light in and function the lights at Hamel Drive coming out you aren't going to effectively change anything.

Chairman Garrity stated again you made the statement that they are coming out of the plaza.

Alderman Gatsas responded well that is not necessarily true because they could be coming down from Arah Street and some people have learned that sometimes coming down Arah and cutting across Hamel is a shorter distance than worrying about Campbell Street.

Chairman Garrity stated on this plan I see 240 cars going in and 180 cars coming out of Northside Plaza. Am I reading it right?

Mr. Sheppard responded yes.

Chairman Garrity stated that is an impact and that is why I feel that there should be some private investment on this project.

Alderman Roy stated the redesign of that intersection picks up 150' of roadway and instead of having one turning lane from Campbell onto DW Highway going north it increases it two-fold. There are now two turning lanes and the additional 150'.

Chairman Garrity stated there is only one entrance to that plaza is there not.

Alderman Roy responded there are two.

Chairman Garrity asked there are no counts for the one in the rear.

Mr. Sheppard answered no. That is really not the entrance that people are directed to. Some people do sneak in the back but it is the main entrance that we took the counts from.

Chairman Garrity stated the facts are the facts. It is 240 in and 180 out.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you have the traffic count in front of you. How many cars are going left or right onto Hamel Drive?

Mr. Sheppard asked left or right as they are coming from Bicentennial.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the total.

Mr. Sheppard stated as they are going from Bicentennial onto Hamel Drive is that the question.

Alderman Gatsas stated I look at this traffic study and if somebody tells me that 240 cars go in and only 180 come out I want to know where they are stacking the other 60 cars.

Mr. Sheppard stated what you have to understand is that this is at a point in time. So it is not the same 180 cars going out as the 240 cars coming in. Someone sits there say for an hour and they are counting the cars going in and coming out. So it is not the same cars going in as coming out.

Chairman Garrity stated or 60 could be going out the rear up to Hamel Drive.

Mr. Sheppard responded they do have a back entrance.

Alderman Gatsas stated so my next question is in that same hour at Bicentennial and Hamel how many cars do you show there taking a left or right onto Hamel Drive.

Mr. Sheppard replied if you look at the am volumes you would take the 84 plus the 3, which would be 87 coming from Bicentennial onto Hamel Drive if that is the question.

Alderman Gatsas asked so where did those 180 cars go that left there that hour.

Mr. Sheppard stated again there is a note there that the counts for the area were made at different times than the other counts. We had to take counts up at that entrance obviously on a different date. We did not redo all of the counts at this intersection. We didn't want to spend the money to redo all of these traffic counts. We did the counts up at that intersection at the entrance at the request of the Committee. The numbers that we have there are a different day...it is the same time but a different day so counts from one Saturday to the next Saturday maybe different so it is difficult to correlate the numbers that we have drawn in in the upper right hand corner, the existing numbers, from a previous traffic count. We got that information...I believe Alderman Osborne was looking to see what the volume of vehicles or percentage of vehicles were going in and out of the plaza. That was the intent of that count. If you were to try to correlate that to the rest of these numbers, we would have had to go out and take traffic counts at every one of those intersections, as well as the entrance to try to balance those out.

Alderman Gatsas stated and I bring you right back to where Campbell Street goes down where you are stacking them because 80% of the cars are making that left hand turn going down to DW Highway so unless you have a light there your stacking problem is going to be the same thing if somebody crosses that intersection. You are going to stop the traffic that goes up Campbell Street from Daniel Webster.

Mr. Sheppard replied right. There are two things that are being done under the plan. Bicentennial now becomes the through lane out to Hamel Street and Hamel Street becomes a stop into Bicentennial and as Alderman Roy stated earlier and I am not too sure and I guess you may not agree with this but we are having two lanes and it is being extended by 150' so there will be more storage and it will be less likely that vehicles will be backed up beyond that Hamel Drive or

Bicentennial Drive intersection coming onto Campbell Street. So there is less chance that cars are going to back up to that intersection because there is more storage. That is my opinion.

Alderman Gatsas stated that is as good as anybody's.

Alderman Osborne stated rear enders are not caused...that is one person in back of another type of thing not paying attention. It has nothing to do with this intersection at all. It is just not paying attention to the car in front of you stopping is all it is. It is not caused because of the intersection.

Alderman Roy stated I couldn't agree personally with Alderman Gatsas more but because we were looking to value engineer this I know when the engineers looked at it they originally had a light at that intersection and when the traffic engineer came back the light was not part of the project. When I questioned that it was just cost and necessity. If we were to go forward with the road reconstruction then we could absolutely, as Alderman Gatsas suggested phase in a light as needed over the next couple of years and I would definitely support that either today or a year from now or two years from now or long after I am not an Alderman. I would definitely support Alderman Gatsas' suggestion that a light is necessary there but again trying to get this down to the bare bones cost to get it as safe as it could possibly be with the dollars that we have to expend. This is where we are at.

Alderman Gatsas asked Kevin can we put a light where Bicentennial comes out now or Hamel, I guess Hamel. Wouldn't that solve 85% of the problem?

Mr. Sheppard answered I guess I would have to take a look at the numbers. I understand what you are saying. That light would have to be coordinated with the signal up at Campbell and DW Highway.

Alderman Gatsas asked and if it was what is the cost of a light.

Mr. Sheppard answered probably \$60,000 to \$70,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated I suggest we send him back and do a coordination of the lights for \$70,000.

Mr. Sheppard responded I think that is an idea but I am not convinced that that will work. That is my opinion.

Alderman Roy stated though I hate to agree with Alderman Gatsas on one comment and disagree with him on the next, part of what the traffic study that I went for last year was to create something that wasn't my opinion or the former

Alderman's opinion or Frank Thomas' or Kevin's opinion but a professional traffic engineer's opinion and that is why we spent the money last year to have CLD go out and design a roadway that could absorb the stacking and have a plan out until 2016 so that once we spent the money on this intersection it would not be something that we would be revisiting every couple of years or getting stop gap measures. The plan as stated goes ahead and creates stacking and creates designated lanes out from the residential areas of Campbell Street to the DW Highway without impeding the turning into or out of Bicentennial as well as people coming off of Daniel Webster and a designated turning lane into Bicentennial where it separates traffic enough that there should be no accidents, therefore, creating a nice safe environment.

Alderman Gatsas stated Kevin my understanding is that CLD was never asked to look at just the light on Hamel.

Mr. Sheppard responded CLD was asked to take a look at the area.

Alderman Gatsas stated but they were never asked to look at just a light that would mitigate the problem that was there.

Mr. Sheppard responded no.

Chairman Garrity asked what would the Committee like to do with this.

Alderman Osborne stated any engineer is going to give you a voluminous engineering plan. They are going to go all the way with it. I like Alderman Gatsas' idea. I think we should start with a light and see what happens. In the meantime we can work on getting some money from Hannaford or the shopping plaza. I think that is a good way to start.

Alderman Duval asked Alderman Roy how long has this been in the works. Three years or four years?

Alderman Roy answered I can't speak for the Alderman who came before me. I know it was a priority for him and it was discussed for many years but the day after I got elected three years ago is when I started working on it. It is a major impact to the residential areas of everyone who uses that intersection.

Alderman Duval asked how many years is a project like this bonded for.

Chairman Garrity stated 20 I believe. Alderman Roy in the three years you have been working on this have you ever approached Northside Plaza?

Alderman Roy replied it has not been the direction by this Committee or any City staff to do that. They are a private property owner and as we work with people for all sorts of reasons I never had that direction.

Alderman Osborne stated if we go ahead the way Alderman Roy...I appreciate his efforts and everything and I can understand the situation and I know it is a dangerous situation but if we go ahead the way he wants to put it in there it is not fair to the other Stop n' Shops and HD's and everybody else that they had to put in so much money for their traffic and here we are giving it away for nothing in my estimate. I think we should start on a smaller scale for now period.

Alderman Roy responded while I couldn't agree with Alderman Osborne more our Planning Board does work with people now for offsite improvements. This was a mistake made by people who sat in these chairs long before we did. If we don't correct these problems then they just fester into worse problems so by taking a step now and biting off this very large amount we can fix it and then I will be the first to say that we work with anyone looking over at the big box to put up the proper amount of off-site improvements.

Alderman Duval stated I don't think that in supporting this project and it has been documented that it has been studied and looked at for a long time I am sure going back to when Alderman Wihby was on this Board representing Ward 1 but I don't think that I would support it without trying to entice the developer to fund part of the project. Perhaps we can do it in such a way to entice them to get to the table and see what they can contribute.

Alderman O'Neil stated we have spent quite a bit of time on this project and I haven't heard one Alderman say I don't think it is worth doing. What we are trying to do is figure out how to do it within the cost estimate that we have. I commend Alderman Roy for that. Not one Alderman has said let's not do it. How we do it has been the discussion and I don't know if we should just catch our breath and take a break on this project in general and come back after we approve the budget and work on this. I personally believe we can get a little more creative than we have so far on how we can get there. I think the estimate is a little high. I think it reflects today's costs but I truly believe...I think if we take some different approaches and it could be just starting with that signal I don't know, that is new information tonight, that we may be able to help improve the accident rate in the area although I don't think it is a significant as some other intersections but more importantly properly get a better flow of traffic in that area. I don't know what a proper motion would be.

Alderman Roy stated if it would please my colleagues on the Board, if we were to put forward a motion of a dollar amount that the Board would be willing to

approve or put into the CIP I would gladly work with Mr. Sheppard and meet with the Northside Plaza owners and the owners of the businesses. So if there was a motion to approve the \$700,000 and we look for the rest either through value engineering or the property owner I would gladly agree with that. I just don't want this to die.

Alderman Duval stated in a case like this historically do we put together a negotiating team that could perhaps meet with the developer so that this is not just on the shoulders of Alderman Roy although I certainly trust his confidence. Perhaps Mr. Borek in the Economic Development office could invite them here and participate in a good fair exchange of dialogue regarding their interest in helping fund this project. I think that would go a long way, at least for me, in really working to address these conditions. I know most of them are not accident related. It is really a traffic condition. I would be curious to see if we could put together that team Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Osborne stated Alderman Gatsas' idea – could we get an exact figure on the situation at the Hamel and Campbell intersection.

Chairman Garrity asked could we get a price on a light at Hamel and Campbell quickly. What does it average - \$70,000?

Mr. Sheppard answered \$60,000 to \$75,000. I guess...it is the caveat that I am not too sure that the problem that exists out there...it is not only and I am sure Alderman Gatsas has seen it, the traffic backs up on Bicentennial because it cannot get out to Hamel Drive because Hamel Drive is a through street and you have people sneaking out the back of the Northside Plaza coming down Hamel Drive. That is why under this new scenario Bicentennial Drive is made the through street and Hamel Street was made the intersection street or a stop at Bicentennial. I am not...it is my opinion only again but a signal at that intersection may not solve the problem. I think it would help the problem but I don't believe that is a solution to this area.

Alderman Osborne asked could we get a study on it.

Mr. Sheppard answered we could do that.

Chairman Garrity asked did you say it would help it a bit. Is that an accurate statement? I know Alderman Gatsas spent three hours out there.

Alderman Gatsas stated I did and I can tell you that the traffic that you see there coming across that hill in the morning is trying to beat the yellow light going across and I bet a lot of those accidents happen because somebody was trying to

beat a light because it happens all the time. At 7 AM people are trying to make that left hand turn and they are moving down Campbell Street. I think as soon as you put in three lanes you are going to move traffic that much faster. I would think that we best be cautious of worrying about seven accidents before we put in three lanes and make it pretty close to a thoroughfare coming down DW Highway. Maybe Kevin that is not your opinion either.

Chairman Garrity stated I need a motion and I really don't want to do a receive and file motion.

Alderman Osborne moved to table.

Alderman Roy asked can I make a suggestion on a motion. Just to summarize if the Committee would like to put \$700,000 into this year's CIP and create a task force of...

Chairman Garrity interjected I won't accept that motion.

There was no second to the tabling motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked am I correct that and I will ask the Finance Officer or Mr. MacKenzie to address this but there generally is some flexibility during the year am I correct.

Chairman Garrity asked flexibility with the bonding.

Alderman O'Neil answered bonding and I would even dare say cash if necessary. If we don't take action between now and the middle of June that does not prevent us from doing anything in the next fiscal year correct?

Mr. MacKenzie stated a bond is a little different from cash. Cash does lock you into an appropriation and you have to stick with that unless you reopen the budget according to the Charter. A bond you can...

Alderman O'Neil interjected or find some balances.

Mr. MacKenzie stated you could find balances from existing line items or departments. You can bond during the year if there is an emergency that arises or an opportunity. Again, we work with Finance to make sure that they follow some general indebtedness guidelines but the Board can bond during the year.

Alderman O'Neil stated my point being if we don't solve this in the next month it doesn't not prevent trying to come up with some solution in the next 12 months correct.

Mr. MacKenzie responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked Kevin would you agree with that.

Mr. Sheppard answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked Mr. Clougherty is that a yes from you as well.

Kevin Clougherty, Finance Officer, answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated so the point being we can beat this thing for the next hour. I think we all agree let's take a step back and take a look at it again. I don't think any of us are saying stop and don't do the project. Let's regroup and see what alternatives can be looked at. I don't know what the proper motion would be. Table would be the motion. Alderman Roy are you okay with that? That doesn't kill it.

Chairman Garrity stated I don't want to receive and file it because then the whole process has to start over again.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am trying to get Alderman Roy say it is okay to table this.

Alderman Roy stated I am definitely afraid with the length of time this project has been out there and with the agreement that it is a bad situation from the prior Alderman in Ward 1 to myself that if it is tabled it will never happen. I just ask Kevin to comment. Just so that we understand what we are talking about, \$1.1 million bonded if Kevin could give that answer as to what this would cost. We are talking about a safety issue and we are talking about an intersection that we all agree is bad and the effect to the taxpayer I think is far greater in the increased safety than it will be in the tax rate.

Mr. Clougherty responded if you were to take \$1 million and divide it by 20 and then apply the same amount of interest we are talking about somewhere around \$100,000 that you would be paying in additional debt service for that \$1 million. That is a general rule of thumb.

Alderman Roy asked if you take that \$100,000 and spread it against our tax rate what are we talking about for additional money.

Mr. Clougherty answered every \$1.3 million is a 1% tax rate increase so you are talking about less than 1%.

Alderman Roy asked so we are talking a couple of pennies.

Mr. Clougherty answered on the rate. Again, what happens with these projects is you end up bundling them together and doing a much bigger project. Whether we would issue the debt this year or in subsequent years would depend on the timing of the project and the cash flow.

Alderman Roy asked so if this was approved in the CIP program you would not actually go out for bonding for possibly six or eight months.

Mr. Clougherty answered at least.

Alderman Roy stated so the Committee could appropriate the money without you actually going out and borrowing it.

Mr. Clougherty replied well I wouldn't say that because as I said if you appropriate and you approve it this year it would perhaps be in a bond issue later this year and there would at least be an interest payment.

Alderman O'Neil moved to table. I give my commitment here tonight to Alderman Roy that I will make sure this thing doesn't sit and die. I think we are heading in the right direction. I still think it needs some work. I am not comfortable voting on a \$1 million bond on this tonight because I think there are some ways we can address some of the costs in here.

Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity called for a recess.

Chairman Garrity called the meeting back to order.

Chairman Garrity stated we are still on Item 11a. Mr. Sheppard do you need to address any of those?

Mr. Sheppard stated that is just for informational purposes.

Alderman Duval asked on the start-up program for sidewalks do you need a motion on that. He is requesting an early start-up.

Chairman Garrity asked would this also include the school bonding project for enclosed classrooms at Parker-Varney.

Mr. Sheppard answered that is a separate project.

Chairman Garrity asked the Clerk are we doing that separately.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it is really too late to do expedited projects at this point. What we did do is we were requested to put the bond on for the school project and we did do that. It is on the Board's agenda for tomorrow night and we will start that process and it will be completed the same night as the CIP is adopted. There were no other projects requested by the Chair or others.

Chairman Garrity asked could we add the 50/50 Sidewalk Program in the form of a motion to go to the full Board tomorrow night. Is that what you are asking for Alderman Duval?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered the problem is that it is a bond resolution and a bond resolution has to appear on the agenda to be introduced at a regular meeting, which is what I was trying to explain to certain people a few days ago. I guess the short answer to that is probably not. A bond needs to appear on the agenda. That is our process of advertising under statute as I understand it. The only one that is going forward at this point would be the school project. We can at the June meeting introduce any other bonds that you want to start the process on and then hold a special meeting perhaps the week after if the Board is adopting at that point. We will watch it at that point and if there is an opportunity we will certainly put them in – whatever projects you want to put forward we will do and get them in the process.

Alderman Duval asked so that means this was tardy getting on the agenda or was this a late...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected no. Typically the bond projects in the next fiscal year would not be introduced until after the next fiscal year's budget is adopted. In this instance the FY07 CIP. The Chairman had a conversation with me and indicated to me that they wanted to move along with the school project so we put the bond on the agenda for next week. That was the only project that we were asked to do that with.

Chairman Garrity asked so we will take it up tomorrow night. It is on tomorrow night's agenda right.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered the one for the school project is on tomorrow night's agenda.

Chairman Garrity stated I am going to take Items 11b and 11d together. In working with CIP staff I came up with a proposal that takes care of a lot of the issues that some of the Aldermen were requesting and things of that nature. I guess I will ask Bob MacKenzie to address Item 11c first. That is increasing some chronic drain and things like that per a request of Alderman DeVries. Maybe you could better explain that Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. MacKenzie responded 11c is actually a little different. That item changes were we have to commit federal funds so it is really a swap on the MCRC. We have to swap funds or we run into problems with HUD. They have had commitments to the MCRC Center on Lake Avenue for approximately five years now and we have to, in accordance with HUD regulations, roll it into another project.

Alderman O'Neil stated Bob I know that we had asked the Facilities Division of Highway to get involved and help take a look at it again. This doesn't affect that work at all right?

Mr. MacKenzie replied this will not affect that no.

Chairman Garrity stated I will just note to the Committee that if you go down the resolution item 3 that says by adding 214406 Easter Seals Water Damage Remediation Project, that is something that Easter Seals came to us for.

Alderman O'Neil asked does that have anything to do with the preschool that is there.

Chairman Garrity answered I don't believe so.

Alderman O'Neil stated this probably came up but why are we going to provide them money when we don't do it for anyone else.

Chairman Garrity responded it was a request during the last term to try to find some funding sources. It was a request to me and it is coming out of CDBG. It was my thought that they do a lot for the community and they save us a lot of dollars with their services. I mean it is up to the Committee.

Alderman O'Neil replied my concern is if we do it for them it is going to open the door up for everyone especially after this weekend. It is going to open up the door for everyone else.

Alderman Osborne stated that is in my ward. We do have kindergarten there and so on and so forth. Basically we are leasing there and paying the lease so I don't know why we would have liability for the floor or any water.

Chairman Garrity replied it is not a liability. It is a contribution from CDBG funds.

Alderman Roy stated they did make the request last year and they are still upwards of \$100,000 in debt from damage that came to them and they are a non-profit that does work with our neediest individuals in Manchester. I am looking at what we do in City cash for other non-profits and this would fit with that.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would think that this works hand in hand with 11d.

Chairman Garrity stated but these are coming out of FY06 funds I believe.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated Item C is actually a separate resolution so I would look for an approval of the resolution and budget authorizations. If you want to take them together later on that is fine.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am just looking at the rest of these like Serenity Place for \$200,000...are those already in 11d or are they not.

Chairman Garrity asked do you mean are they already in the CIP budget.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could clarify. Item 11c actually has three parts to it. Two of them relate to Item 11d. This is actually FY06 money but two of them do relate to Item 11d. One of them is separate. So perhaps the Board could go through the listing and then come back to this but it is a separate resolution.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded maybe you want to take up Item d and then come back to this.

Chairman Garrity stated let's take 11d first.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied there was a summary that was distributed.

Chairman Garrity stated I will speak to letter d. In our previous meeting or maybe it was two meetings ago, we had a request from a number of Aldermen to add

some items to the CIP budget. This is my proposal. It does not increase the cash side of the CIP budget and it does not increase the bonding on the CIP budget. Maybe I will ask Mr. MacKenzie to go through what line items we are taking. We will start with Serenity Place and explain where those are coming out and at the end we will explain how we got to a zero tax increase and things of that nature.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I will just start running through these or do you want to take them item by item.

Chairman Garrity stated let's just start...let's discuss them all and then we can decide what we want to do.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the first one is Serenity Place. We were recommending \$200,000 from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and that would go into Table 1 and Table 1 is Other Funds of the CIP. Second is Prayer Hall. Their original request was \$39,000. The Mayor's proposal had \$20,000. The Committee showed interest in funding it at the full request so that would be adding \$19,000. Again we felt that could come from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Campbell Street/Hamel Drive we did not have any immediate solutions for and that was discussed tonight. Number four, Hanover Street. I just looked at the cost estimates tonight and those are fairly significant. They range from \$2 million to \$7 million so we did not have a recommendation tonight on those sidewalks. Number 5, Speed Enforcement...

Chairman Garrity interjected is that Speed and Noise Enforcement.

Mr. MacKenzie stated correct. We would be recommending creating a new project in the amount of \$50,000, which would be under Table 3 and transferring a portion from the Municipal Deferred Maintenance Account so that account would go from \$225,000 to \$175,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated just a clarification. That should be Speed/Noise and Traffic enforcement.

Chairman Garrity responded duly noted.

Alderman Gatsas stated there was a \$40,000 grant that looked like it was the same thing for speed enforcement and noise. What happens to that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is still in Table 1 although it does appear that there would be an outside chance of getting that particular grant. That was going to be a grant from the state but it appears more like it is an outside chance of getting that

grant. We would probably suggest that you still leave it in Table 1 in case we get the grant but the chances seem slimmer of getting that.

Alderman Gatsas stated for some reason we have this sheet...do we have something else to look at.

Chairman Garrity responded we do but it is probably more confusing than the one you have in your hands already.

Alderman Gatsas stated if I wasn't confused, I am confused now. I guess you can either have me make my statement now or let Mr. MacKenzie finish but we talked about Washington having their pork barrel funding sources...

Chairman Garrity interjected why don't you save that until the end.

Mr. MacKenzie stated again and the way these are presented these are actually presented in the order that you discussed them at a previous meeting. That is how the order came up. The next item was Weston Observatory Land Clearing. Parks & Recreation said it would be about \$8,000 to \$10,000. They indicated that they could absorb that within the Park Improvement Program if the Committee wanted to accomplish that. So there would be no additional dollar amount added. Number 7 was the West Junior Deb Lighting. The original estimate for that I think was \$109,000. I know there was some work done to try to reduce that pricetag and in the end we are recommending \$75,000 be transferred in essence between bonds from the Valley Cemetery and the Infrastructure Road Management Program. Number 8 is the International Institute. There was discussion about adding \$10,000, which was the amount from last year so they would be level funded. We recommended adding \$5,000 in Table 3, which is Cash, from the chronic drain program and we will be talking about that a little later because we refunded that in another way. We will also add \$5,000 to FY06 with CDBG. That is where the change is coming in for that Item 11c. There was discussion on the Civil War Memorial Improvements to Veteran's Park for somewhere in the order of \$10,000 to \$12,000. Again, Parks & Recreation felt that they could probably fund those improvements to the war memorial from the Park Improvement Program, which is a cash program. Fire Truck #9 came up as an issue. We have had a number of discussions on this. It has been the goal of certainly the Finance Department and the Mayor to fund rolling stock through cash rather than bonding. They indicated a willingness to look at that as an FY08 project for cash. It will take roughly 12 months to spec and then order that engine so the Board could in essence in the next couple of months give the Fire Department a go ahead to spec and bid it and then bring the contract back to the Board indicating that it be for delivery in FY08. Number 11 is HR support. I think the Board was talking about looking for \$40,000 to \$45,000 in HR support.

We did come up with \$39,065 for that from four sources. One is \$10,000 from the Convention & Visitor's Bureau. \$5,000 from chronic drain. \$5,000 from the Millyard ongoing maintenance and \$19,065 from the Childcare Coordinator. Going back to chronic drain you might have noticed that we took roughly \$10,000 out of that for the project but would be recommending that CDBG be used to fund \$25,000 so that would be a total of \$50,000 for chronic drain, which is up \$15,000 from the current number. Number 13 there was a request to include the Second Street neighborhood and list of neighborhoods that would be studied and there would be improvements to in the next couple of years. That can be accomplished by a description change. Calef Road Park. The Parks & Recreation Department did come back and say to properly do the park they would need \$120,000 more. We indicated that that could come from the Infrastructure Road Management Program. The Easter Seals was just discussed. That is the second item that was in 11c. Because it is FY06 we can use existing CDBG funds of \$10,000 in the FY06 program. Finally Second Street/Queen City. Again, the Board did not discuss this particular one at the last meeting but it was requested by Chairman Garrity on behalf of Alderman Smith who was trying to find a solution to a problem at Second Street and Woodbury. We were recommending that that be \$50,000 in bond by decreasing the Infrastructure Road Management. There are two items that the Committee has already taken an action on and will be forwarded. That is the Gill Stadium change and the Fun in the Sun and after school programs. I would like to pause there before going on to the next page. The next page are just basic technical corrections that the staff has to the CIP.

Alderman O'Neil asked on Item 10 I don't think we should move forward immediately on this. I think we should see how this plays out because unfortunately as it is currently structured to buy a new Engine #9 it is going to cost us some other vehicles and I know I have had some discussions with you and the Mayor about taking a look at some other options with that. I just want to be clear that although I think it is important it shouldn't be at the cost of other things right now.

Alderman Osborne stated I was just wondering on the neighborhood projects again the \$500,000 that we are talking about last year when Mayor Baines took a walk around the wards with us. What is the story with that again or what is the status?

Mr. MacKenzie responded I will probably ask Sam. I know there was a newspaper report about that but they were not quoting it correctly. It was not \$500,000 for the neighborhoods. I wasn't on the walk so I am not sure what Mayor Baines said at the time but Sam can you clarify that? It was not just neighborhoods.

Mr. Maranto stated we set aside \$500,000 in the CIP budget relative to putting into action various strategies and studies that we just had done like the downtown study and economic development study. We did speak about having CDBG funds for neighborhoods. I believe it was \$250,000. We are putting additional money into those neighborhoods and we will continue but that \$500,000 was basically to put into action the various recommendations from the studies that we had. It wasn't strictly tied to neighborhoods.

Alderman Osborne asked so we are talking \$250,000 now.

Mr. Maranto answered well this current year but we also have additional money in the CIP in FY07. You will notice on Item 11c we are putting additional funds into that account.

Alderman Osborne asked CDBG.

Mr. Maranto answered yes.

Alderman Osborne asked how much of that is there or how much is left or where are we with that.

Mr. Maranto answered right now we have \$150,000. We are recommending an additional \$38,000 if you act on it this evening and in the FY07 CIP we have \$250,000 additional recommended.

Alderman Osborne asked so we are talking \$350,000.

Mr. Maranto answered about \$440,000.

Chairman Garrity stated again I will remind the Committee that there is no impact on the tax rate with this proposal. As a matter of fact, it reduces bonding by \$50,000.

Alderman Roy stated I have two very brief questions. On the decrease in Valley Cemetery and Infrastructure/Road Management what was the breakdown of the decrease to Valley Cemetery?

Chairman Garrity responded it went from \$300,000 to \$250,000.

Alderman Roy stated the only other comment I will make is something that came up in discussion regarding the Speed/Noise Traffic Enforcement and creating a new project in the amount of \$50,000 by reducing the Municipal Deferred Maintenance. I think we get a bang for our buck hour wise if we put someone on

staff with designated responsibilities versus paying overtime as Alderman Gatsas and I and others have brought up in the past. It is not effect on the tax rate. It is \$50,000 in City cash or roughly the same in a salary in the Police operating budget.

Alderman O'Neil asked have we taken a look at the difference between funding all of that overtime and hiring a full-time police officer. We attempted to hire a full-time police officer this current fiscal year and I guess it didn't happen.

Chairman Garrity replied you can say that you don't want to do it that way and we will do it this way. This is just a recommendation. Before Alderman Gatsas makes his comments there are some big numbers in here and he is probably going to call it pork but I don't apologize for fighting for a park in my ward at all. Those are my comments.

Alderman Gatsas stated I wasn't directing my comments to you but if you want to take them that way...I look at this CIP budget and I will call it pork because that is what they call it in Washington. We talk about bridges to nowhere and I bet if we go through this there are bridges to nowhere. I look at this and if we are cutting schools and cutting every other department then we as Aldermen should start looking at our pet projects and start cutting those because they are bonded. So yes there is pork and it is here and I understand that and maybe we have never gone through it and considered that and everybody maybe kept their heads in the sand but these are pork projects. I look at them and are they...in anybody's ward sure you can say they are great and I understand that but when we are doing cutting in the budget and we are saying live within our means then maybe we should bond instead of \$10 million maybe we should bond \$7 million and take a look at what that bonding means in FY08. Maybe it means nothing in FY07 because those funds aren't going to be spent but if we start spending them in FY08 they make a difference. I look at it and say every Alderman should take a look at these and say how do we make our concession going forward and telling people what we see here because I don't think most people identify what is in these CIP projects. I think that if they did they would be amazed at what we spend money on. Certainly I don't have a problem identifying them but we should sit here and somebody is going to say it is federal funds but I look and say okay...I go right to the first page, actually the second page. The Health Department...

Chairman Garrity interjected are you going to give us some recommendations tonight.

Alderman Gatsas asked would you like them. I won't give them to you tonight but I might give them to you tomorrow night after I go through this and cut the pork.

Chairman Garrity answered well make sure it comes through the CIP Committee first.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am looking at the Health Department. In the Health Department right here there is \$1.3 million of funding.

Chairman Garrity asked what table are you on.

Alderman Gatsas answered I am on Page 1 of the blue book that we have. From the state there is \$1,345,000 worth of funds that we get. Their total budget, excluding the nurses is \$1.9 million. Does anybody know where that \$1.3 million goes and whether it accommodates five employees or fifty employees? Shouldn't we as a City know that? I am looking at a difference in a budget of \$600,000 and we don't really know where it is.

Chairman Garrity asked you are on Table 1 where all of the state sources are listed.

Alderman Gatsas answered yes and I understand they are funds coming from somewhere else and I don't disagree with that Alderman but at some point when it is \$1.3 million and their whole budget is \$1.9 million shouldn't we ask questions about what that \$1.3 million goes to. I know it says here funds to support the healthcare services for homeless persons in Manchester - \$320,000. Well do we go out and give checks to the homeless people? Where do those funds go? Do we have an employee that looks at those funds and allocates them to the shelters that they need to go to?

Chairman Garrity stated early in the process the Mayor did have his CIP hearings and a lot of those folks did come in front of him. I did sit in on a lot of those meetings and a lot of that was explained during those hearings. I know that Mr. Wood and Mr. Duckoff were there during those hearings regarding Valley Street Cemetery. A lot of those organizations do come in front of us at the hearings.

Alderman Gatsas asked where does the money go Alderman. Do we just look at a flat line of \$320,000 that comes from the state and we shouldn't have any understanding of where that goes as a Board?

Chairman Garrity answered I am quite sure there are some guidelines that they have to meet. I am quite sure there are some guidelines and Sam or Bob MacKenzie could probably help us on that. I am sure there are guidelines. You would know with grants coming down from the state you have to meet certain guidelines and there are certain restrictions on those dollars I am quite sure.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am waiting for someone to respond.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we do ask for detailed descriptions for each project. We do have two volumes of information that each department submits. The Health Department has been very effective. When their own operating budget has been limited they have been very effective in getting both CDC and state grants to address some of these things in particular. If your question is how many FTE's they are creating by these grants, I think we would have to have Fred Ruscsek here. We do have the background data and we do have the books on every single grant in here, what they want to accomplish, how they are going to accomplish it, whether the money is being used to contract out or to pay for salaries and benefits. We can try to provide those to the Committee. It is roughly two full 4" binders for all of the projects.

Alderman Gatsas replied I don't question whether there is documentation but I think we have taken a \$140 million or \$130 million budget on the City side and gone through it and asked questions. We are looking at \$10 million of funds here or over that and we just kind of look at these and don't really get into it. There is \$50 million and we just kind of look at them. If this isn't truly pork I would believe that people in Washington don't believe theirs is pork either.

Chairman Garrity responded that being said I know that a lot of the agencies that come in for cash and things like that, I do know that CIP staff does have strict monitoring for those agencies. They have to meet certain goals and things of that nature. I think there is a lot of oversight in where this money goes, including this Committee.

Alderman Gatsas asked well tell me what the funding of the purchase of land adjacent to Crystal Lake Park is. What are we buying?

Mr. MacKenzie answered there is a piece of property that is three acres that encompasses part of the lakeshore. That had been requested as part of the Master Plan by the Parks & Recreation Department. They have been trying to actively protect the watershed because there is no stream coming into Crystal Lake so the only way to protect the water quality is to protect some of the watershed land.

Alderman Gatsas asked and that can come from the Airport Mitigation Fund.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked what else can come from this Airport Mitigation Fund. There must be something in Ward 2 I can mitigate or there must be something in Ward 4 that Alderman Duval can mitigate from the Airport because I know there

are a lot of planes...you know the aircraft that come over Ward 2 are the cargo planes and they make a lot more noise than the passenger plans.

Mr. MacKenzie answered as I understand Airport Mitigation they are in the process of negotiating with EPA and state DES for some of the construction activity they have done where they have basically interfered with some of the wetlands and they have to provide conservation land or other conservation easements to offset those changes that they have made. That will probably take about a year and they will go through and EPA and DES will be the final ones to pick the mitigation projects. I have to say that is not how you would define a pork project. That is required by the federal government. We follow their guidelines and they have more stringent guidelines as well. This has to be for land conservation purposes.

Chairman Garrity asked do you have any further questions Alderman Gatsas.

Alderman Gatsas answered no I guess I will just let my statements stand and I would ask the 14 Aldermen of this Board to at least find some ways to cut these projects so that we are not bonding as many dollars because I think if we are going to go in and cut departments and do various things to the School District we should be in here cutting the pork barrel that we have in front of us.

Chairman Garrity stated that being said I know that Mayor Guinta did reduce our bonding substantially and this proposal also reduces it.

Alderman Gatsas stated I didn't lay this on the Mayor. I made a statement that the Board should do it and if you want to put your park in that pork barrel then put it in there. I didn't but you did.

Chairman Garrity responded I did and again I will not apologize for fighting for a park for my ward. Is Derryfield Park in your ward, Alderman?

Alderman Gatsas replied do you want me to remind you just like I did with Alderman O'Neil what happened at Derryfield Park was that everybody was getting their subsidies across the City and \$150,000 was supposed to go to Derryfield Park but because there were federal funds that Mr. MacKenzie thought we could get from a grant we didn't fund Derryfield Park that time out.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated and the funds came from not anything I did but Alderman O'Neil suggested that Singer Family Park funds go to Derryfield Park and that is the most used park in the City.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do want to let the public know that while one Alderman feels it is pork we do have a process where we go to each department and let them prioritize each of the projects. We don't recommend projects unless it is basically consistent with those departmental requests. Calef Road park, for example, was the Parks & Recreation Department's number one request out of 27 projects.

Alderman Gatsas asked and how much are we spending there.

Mr. MacKenzie answered \$460,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much was totally spent at Derryfield.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it was over \$800,000 in total out of three funding cycles plus \$200,000 earmarked for the Weston Tower.

Chairman Garrity stated again Calef Road park was the number one priority in the recently done Parks Master Plan and the Parks & Recreation Department. I wasn't item 14 or 15. It was the number one priority from the department.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we...I know it has been a long budget process for us. We are all sick of meeting. I know that it is not uncommon for the Chairman to try to pull all of the information that has been gathered at public hearings and comments made by elected officials in departments and try to pull it into some form and that is what you have done and I thank you for pulling it together so we can at least try to bring some closure to this and get on.

Alderman Roy stated Mr. MacKenzie just made a comment that I will take extreme exception to. One of the things that I am very proud that the Mayor is doing is talking about performance based budgeting and looking at priorities across the City and with all due respect and I know your park was the number one priority for Parks but the number nine priority for the Highway Department was an intersection and a safety concern on Campbell Street in Ward 1. While I do agree with Alderman Gatsas that we do need to tighten our belts and look at our projects, my name is here for one thing and that is a City intersection and I would like to see in the future...it may not happen this year but I would like this Board next year when we look at our priorities to look Citywide. The number one through ten priorities for Parks or other departments may not be as high as the twentieth priority in the Police or Fire Departments. I would ask us to not only look at the departmental request but to look at how they fit as priorities across the City. I will definitely and I will always do this whether it is my project or anyone else's support safety before recreation. Two of my best supporters are sitting in the audience protecting Valley Cemetery and they know that when it comes down to it

I will go in that direction – public safety over recreation and I will not apologize for that. I ask the City fathers to go ahead and prioritize across the City.

Chairman Garrity asked can I get a motion to move this to the full Board.

Alderman O'Neil moved to recommend approval of the changes to the CIP budget, as outlined, to the full Board. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I am asking if it is going forward as a recommendation from the Committee.

Alderman O'Neil answered yes.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked is that just for the proposed CIP changes that were handed out. The action to be taken would be to recommend the changes that are shown on the report that reflects all of the tables. I just want to make that clear.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated to recommend the changes in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5 and subsequently the changes to any paragraphs contained in the CIP resolution that would correspond, which are basically the increases in Table 1.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to bring up the 50/50 Sidewalk Program as an expedient project. It could be amended tomorrow night.

Chairman Garrity asked does that have to be a recommendation from this Committee.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered it could be done in Finance or it could be done here.

Chairman Garrity stated we will send that recommendation along too.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked can you identify what that is.

Alderman Lopez stated it is a resolution for the bonding.

Chairman Garrity stated it is for the 50/50 Sidewalk Program. We want to expedite that.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I thought we already discussed that before. You can't...a bond resolution needs to be introduced at a regular meeting of the Board and it has to appear on the agenda. We don't have it on the agenda for tomorrow night. We can't introduce a bond resolution for that tomorrow night. We can't introduce it now until June so expediting it and trying to put it in a different fiscal year isn't going to change a thing. If you are trying to change an amount we can do that.

Chairman Garrity asked even if it is a full vote of the Board we can't...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected no.

Chairman Garrity asked so it has to be on the agenda when the agendas go out.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied that is correct. That was the point I tried to make earlier. If you are trying to change an amount on the project...I thought that is what you were asking for before. We will put that bond resolution on based on whatever amount is on the CIP at that point in time for the June meeting and then if the budget is not done and you come back five days later at a special Board meeting and adopt the budget you can bring the bond resolution in that night for adoption but that is the best you are going to be able to do at this point.

Alderman O'Neil asked so we have never accepted a bond resolution at a meeting.

Deputy City Clerk answered no. A regular meeting of the Board is where it gets introduced and it gets introduced in the agenda always. You can come back at a special meeting and adopt it.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the motion to recommend approval of the changes to the CIP budget, as outlined, to the full Board.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the motion again.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the motion is to recommend approval of all of the changes that have been outlined.

Chairman Garrity again called for a vote. The motion passed with Aldermen Gatsas and Osborne duly recorded in opposition.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we would also look for a motion on the amending resolution as well.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorizations for \$177,650 in prior year CDBG funds.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Duval it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee